ARSHAK BARTOUMIAN (SBN 210370)
OMNIA LEGAL, INC.
124 W STOCKER ST STE B
GLENDALE, CA 91202
T. 818-532-9339
F. 818-394-6452
EMAIL: DISPUTES@OMNIALEGAL.ORG

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

RK.U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT QF CALIFORNIA

CHRISTINE HANNA, an individual, Plaintiff.

VS.

BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC., A Delaware Limited Liability Company

CAPITAL ONE N.A., A National Association CHASE BANK USA N.A., A National

Association

CITIBANK SD, N.A., A National Association

HSBC BANK USA N.A., A National

16 | Association

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOM, INC., A

California Corporation

MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC., A Delaware

Limited Liability Company

Defendants.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:

1) VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT:

1.2.7703 DMG (JCG2

2) VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S CONSUMER CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES ACT:

 VIOLASATIONS OF FEDERAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT;

4) VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT:

5) DECLARATORY RELIEF.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

This action is brought by Plaintiff CHRISTINE HANNA ("Plaintiff") by and through her attorney Arshak Bartoumian against all named Defendants for violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act [15 U.S.C. §1681 et seq.] ("FCRA") and California's Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act [California Civil Code §1785.2 et seq.] ("CCRAA"), and for violations of Fair Debt Collection Practices Act [15 U.S.C. §1692-1692p] ("FDCPA"), California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act [California Civil Code §1788 et seq.] ("RFDCPA") against select Defendants.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

4

1

2

3

5 6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13 14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22 23

25

26

24

27 28

Congress enacted the FCRA to establish consumer rights to privacy over 1. their credit and financial information and to ensure the "[a]ccuracy and fairness of credit reporting." FCRA provides several protections for consumers, including but not limited to the right to be notified of any negative/unfavorable information reported in their name and the right to dispute inaccurate, outdated and/or incomplete information on their credit file.

- FCRA regulates credit reporting agencies as well as creditors, collection 2. agencies and other parties who provide information to credit reporting agencies and/or obtain and use the consumer credit reports. FCRA Section 623, 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2, imposes obligations on furnishers of information to the credit reporting agencies. Furnishers must report accurate information, correct and update erroneous information, and provide certain notices to consumer pertaining to furnished information.
- CCRAA was implemented to protect the credit information of California 3. consumers. CCRAA also regulates consumer credit reporting agencies and furnishers of information with respect to personal, credit and other financial information submitted and maintained in their credit file. CCRAA in California Civil Code §1785.25-1785.26 refrains furnishers of information from reporting information that they know or should have known was erroneous, and obligates furnishers to cease credit reporting of information disputed by consumers without notice of such dispute.
- CCRAA provides consumers with the right to be informed of negative credit reporting and the right to dispute information in their credit reports, which they believe is incomplete and/or inaccurate. Consumers also have the right to bring civil action against violators of any provision of the CCRAA with respect to their rights and their credit, and to seek monetary damages. California Civil Code §1785.19 and §1785.31. The FDCPA regulates the behavior of collection agencies attempting to collect a debt on behalf of another. The United States Congress has found abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors, and has determined that abusive debt collection practices contribute to a number of personal bankruptcies,

marital instability, loss of jobs, and invasions of individual privacy. Congress enacted the FDCPA to eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to ensure that those debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote uniform State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses [15 U.S.C. §1692(a)-(e)].

- 5. The FDCPA is a strict liability statute, which provides for actual or statutory damages upon the showing of one violation. The Ninth Circuit has held that whether a debt collector's conduct violates the FDCPA should be judged from the standpoint of the "least sophisticated" consumer. [Baker v. G.C. Services Corp., 677 F.2d 775, 778 (9th Cir. 1982); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc. 869 F.2d 1222, 1227(9th Cir.1988)]. This objective standard "ensure[s] that the FDCPA protects all consumers, the gullible as well as the shrewd ... the ignorant, the unthinking and the credulous." [Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F.2d 1314, 1318-19 (2nd Cir. 1993)].
- 6. To prohibit deceptive practices the FDCPA, at 15 U.S.C. §1692e, outlaws the use of false, deceptive, and misleading collection letters and names a non-exhaustive list of certain per se violations of false and deceptive collection conduct. 15 U.S.C. §1692e(1)-(16).
- 7. To prohibit harassment and abuses by debt collectors the FDCPA, at 15 U.S.C. §1692d, provides that a debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt and names a non-exhaustive list of certain per se violations of harassing and abusive collection conduct. 15 U.S.C. §1692d(1)-(6). Among these per se violations prohibited by that section are: any collection activities and the placement of telephone calls without meaningful disclosure of the caller's identity [15 U.S.C. §1692d(6)]
- 8. The FDCPA also prohibits, at 15 U.S.C. §1692c, without the prior consent of the consumer given directly to the debt collector, or the express permission of a court of competent jurisdiction, or as reasonably necessary to effectuate a post judgment judicial remedy, communication by a debt collector in connection with the collection of any debt, with any person other than the consumer, her attorney, a consumer reporting agency if otherwise permitted by law, the creditor, the attorney of the creditor, or the attorney of the

debt collector.

9. The RFDCPA regulates collection agencies and original creditors attempting to collect debts on their own behalf. The California legislature has determined that the banking and credit system and grantors of credit to consumers are dependent upon the collection of just and owing debts and that unfair or deceptive collection practices undermine the public confidence that is essential to the continued functioning of the banking and credit system and sound extensions of credit to consumers. The Legislature has further determined that there is a need to ensure that debt collectors exercise their responsibility with fairness, honesty, and due regard for the debtor's rights and that debt collectors must be prohibited from engaging in unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

I. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 15 U.S.C. §1681p, California Civil Code §1785.33, and 28 U.S.C. §1337.
 - 11. Supplemental jurisdiction rests upon 28 U.S.C. §1367.
- 12. Venue is proper in this United States District Court, Central District of California because Defendants' violations alleged below occurred in the County of Los Angeles, State of California and within this District.

II. PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION

13. FCRA Sections 616 and 617, 15 U.S.C. §1681n and §1681o, create private right of action consumers can bring against violators of any provision of the FCRA with regards to their credit. In DiMezza v. First USA Bank, Inc., supra, the court confirmed that "[...] the plain language of [CRA Sections 616 and 617, 15 U.S.C. §1681n and §1681o] provide a private right of action for a consumer against furnishers of information who have willfully or negligently failed to perform their duties upon notice of a dispute. [...] there is a private right of action for consumers to enforce the investigation and reporting duties imposed on furnishers of information."

- 14. Gorman v. MBNA America Bank, N.A., No. 06-17226 further established Private Remedy Against Furnishers by consumers and FCRA Section 1681s-2(b) triggers Defendants' furnisher's liability under this section, since Plaintiff made her initial disputes with the credit reporting agencies.
- 15. Cal. Civ. Code §1785.15(f) expressly states that consumers "have a right to bring civil action against anyone [...], who improperly obtains access to a file, knowingly or willfully misuses file data, or fails to correct inaccurate file data" concerning a consumer's credit report. Plaintiff has further right to action pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code §1785.31(a), which states that Plaintiff as "any consumer who suffers damages as a result of a violation of this title by any person may bring an action in a court of appropriate jurisdiction against that person to recover the following."
- 16. Sanai v. Saltz, et al., 2009 Cal. App. LEXIS 83 (Cal. App. 2d Dist. Jan. 26, 2009) established that consumers may replead their FCRA claims as violations of the CCRAA and that the state claims are not preempted by FCRA. In further support, courts have uniformly rejected creditors' and consumer reporting agencies' arguments that the FCRA bars state law claims. See Sehl v. Safari Motor Coaches, Inc., 2001 U.S. Dist. Lexis 12638 (U.S.D.C. N.D. Cal. 2001)(for detailed discussion); Harper v. TRW, 881F. Supp. 294 (U.S.D.C. S.D. Mich. 1995); Rule v. Ford Receivables, 36 F. Supp.2d 335 (U.S.D.C. S.D. Va. 1999); Watkins v. Trans Union, 118 F. Supp.2d 1217 (U.S.D.C. N.D. Ala. 2000); Swecker v. Trans Union, 31 F. Supp.2d 536 (U.S.D.C. E.D. Va. 1998); Saia v. Universal Card Svc., 2000 U.S.Dist.Lexis 9494, 2000 Westlaw 863979 (U.S.D.C. E.D. La. 2000); Sherron v. Private Issue by Discover, 977 F. Supp.2d 804 (U.S.D.C. N.D. Miss. 1997); Hughes v. Fidelity Bank, 709 F. Supp.2d 639 (U.S.D.C. E.D. Pa. 1989).
- 17. 15 U.S.C §1692k(a) states that "... any debt collector who fails to comply with any provision of this title with respect to any person is liable to such person in an amount equal to the sum of-."
- 18. Cal. Civ. Code §1788.30(a) states that "any debt collector who violates this title with respect to any debtor shall be liable to that debtor only in an individual action..."

III. THE PARTIES

- 19. Plaintiff CHRISTINE HANNA is a natural person residing in Los Angeles County, State of California.
- 20. Plaintiff is a consumer as defined in 15 U.S.C. §1681a (c) and California Civil Code §1785.3(b).
- 21. Defendant BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC ("BMW") is a Delaware Limited Liability.
 - 22. Defendant CAPITAL ONE N.A. ("CAPITAL") is a National Association.
 - 23. Defendant CHASE BANK USA N.A. ("CHASE") is a National Association.
 - 24. Defendant CITIBANK N.A. ("CITI") is a National Association.
 - 25. Defendant HSBC BANK USA N.A. ("HSBC") is a National Association.
- 26. Defendant MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC ("MIDLAND") is a Delaware Limited Liability Company.
- 27. Defendant VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOM, INC ("VERIZON") is California Corporation.
- 28. Defendants and each one of them is a person as defined in 15 U.S.C. §1681a (b) and California Civil Code §1785.3(j).
- 29. Defendants and each one of them is a furnisher of information within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. §1681-s2.
- 30. Defendants are each a debt collector as defined in 15 U.S.C. §1692a (6) and California Civil Code §1788.2(c).
- 31. Defendants acted through their agents, employees, directors, contractors and other authorized parties acting within the course and scope of their employment or agency and under the direct supervision and control of each respective Defendant.

IV. FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

32. In or around December 14, 2011 Plaintiff, who is not a minor, checked her credit report from the three national credit reporting agencies, Experian, Equifax and Transunion (collectively "CRAs"), and discovered multiple credit accounts reported by Defendants BMW (Account#400082...), CAPITAL (Account#517805230668... & 529107164617...), CHASE (Account#540168308196... & 426684101044...), CITI (Account#751079002993...), HSBC

 (Account#700119110350...), MIDLAND (Account#854267...) and VERIZON (Account#66086146800...) in negative status. These credit accounts were unfamiliar to Plaintiff, as he did not recall ever opening them and he was never informed by the furnishers of their negative credit reporting.

- 33. On or about December 14, 2011 Plaintiff contacted the CRAs and disputed the unknown credit accounts reported by the Defendants identified in paragraph 32, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2(b). On or about February 02, 2011, following her credit bureau disputes, Plaintiff sent letters to these Defendants, in which he requested documentation substantiating the existence, ownership and accuracy of the accounts reported by each of them, otherwise their immediate and permanent deletion from her credit file.
- 34. Upon receipt of Plaintiff's disputes, Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, each continued to report the disputed accounts to the CRAs, without notice that the accounts had been disputed by Plaintiff, all throughout the investigation period and thereafter. They further failed to properly address Plaintiff's direct disputes with them and failed to provide for her requested verification for the disputed accounts.
- 35. On February 07, 2012 and March 05, 2012 Plaintiff followed up with Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON and each one of them on multiple occasions, resubmitting her requests and demanding deletion of the unverified accounts due to lack of verification, but each of her correspondences went unanswered or were improperly handled and responded to.
- 36. In or about December 14, 2011 Plaintiff consulted with attorneys and credit professionals and retained an agent to communicate with Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON on her behalf regarding her disputes. At the time, during a credit review of her updated credit records, Plaintiff also learned that Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON had reported a charged off accounts to her credit file, without prior notice of the debts or of the negative credit reporting.
- 37. In or around December 14, 2011 Plaintiff contacted the CRAs with dispute of the accounts reported by BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON as not his, since he did not agree with their alleged debts. Following her submission of a credit dispute of the BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, Plaintiff contacted Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON

through her agent with a Power of Attorney and also sent in a debt/account verification/validation to BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON. Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON failed to answer to Plaintiff's debt/account verification/validation requests, failed to cease collection activity and credit reporting upon receipt of Plaintiff's dispute, and failed to inform the CRAs that the accounts were in dispute.

- 38. Plaintiff sent multiple further follow ups to Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, both directly from her and through her agent, but all of her correspondences proved unsuccessful in attaining Defendants' cooperation.
- 39. Regardless of Plaintiff's attempts to seek Defendants' cooperation, Defendants and each one of them continuously failed to answer back to Plaintiff with appropriate proof of investigation and verification of the information in dispute and failed to take corrective action.
- 40. To date Defendants continue to report the unverified accounts on Plaintiff's credit records.
- 41. The inaccurate accounts negatively reflect upon Plaintiff as a consumer, borrower/debtor and they negatively impact her creditworthiness and financial standing.
- 42. Plaintiff has suffered financial and emotional distress as a result of Defendants' violations, which include but are not limited by the following:
- a. Actual damages arising from monetary losses relating to denials to new credit, loss of use of funds, loss of credit and loan opportunities, excessive and/or elevated interest rate and finance charges;
- b. Out of pocket expenses associated with communicating with Defendants, disputing the credit information, and fees paid to attorneys and credit professionals for the assistance attained in the process;
- c. Emotional distress and mental anguish associated with having derogatory credit information transmitted about Plaintiff to other people both known and unknown;
- d. Decreased credit score and creditworthiness, which may result in inability to obtain credit, employment or housing on future attempts.

COUNT I

Violations of FCRA

2

3

5

6 7

8

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25 26

27

28

Against All Defendants

- 43. Plaintiff repeats and reincorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
- 44. Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON knowingly and willfully violated the FCRA. Defendants' violations include, but are not limited to the following:
- a. Furnishing inaccurate/unverified information to the CRAs in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2 (a);
- b. Failing to inform Plaintiff about negative credit reporting made on her is credit report, prior to or within five (5) days of furnishing a collection account to the CRAs, in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2 (a)(7)(A);
- c. Failing to conduct proper investigation of disputed information upon receipt of Plaintiff's dispute in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2 (a)(8)(E);
- d. Verifying disputed accounts with the CRAs prior to conducting thorough investigation and without having substantiating support for such verification;
- e. Reporting disputed information to the CRAs, without notice of Plaintiff's dispute, during the investigation period and prior to providing verification of accuracy in violation of 15 U.S.C. §1681s-2 (a)(3);
- f. Continuing to report unverified information to the CRAs after lack of response and verification:

COUNT II

Violations of CCRAA

Against All Defendants

- 45. Plaintiff repeats and reincorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
- 46. Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON knowingly and willfully violated CCRAA. Defendants' violations include, but are not limited to the following:
- a. Submitting negative credit information to Plaintiff's credit report with the CRAs, without notifying the Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §1785.26(b);

- b. Continuing to report the account to the CRAs, upon receipt of Plaintiff's dispute and during the investigation period, without notice that the account has been disputed by Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §1785.25(c);
- c. Failing to acknowledge Plaintiff's demand for investigation and correction of information furnished to the CRAs, following Plaintiff's receipt of CRAs' reinvestigation results in violation of California Civil Code §1785.30;

COUNT III

Violations of FDCPA

Against Defendants

- 47. Plaintiff repeats and reincorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
- 48. Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON knowingly and willfully violated the FDCPA by:
- a) Failing to provide dunning notice of debt and a written notice of Plaintiff's right to request validation of debt along with information about the alleged debt, including the name and contact information of the original creditor pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692g(a);
- b) Failing to cease collection activity and continuing to make collection efforts on the alleged debt without properly responding to Plaintiff's validation request pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692g(b);
 - c) Failing to properly validate the alleged debt pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692g(b);
- d) Using false representations and deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect the alleged debt pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692e;
- e) Using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect the alleged debt pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692f.

COUNT IV

Violations of RFDCPA

Against Defendants

- 49. Plaintiff repeats and reincorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
- 50. Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON knowingly and willfully violated RFDCPA by:
- a) Using false representations and deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect debts pursuant to Civil Code §1788.17;
- b) Using unfair and/or unconscionable means to collect alleged debts pursuant to California Civil Code §1788.17.

COUNT V

Declaratory Relief

Against All Defendants

- 51. Plaintiff repeats and reincorporates by reference the above paragraphs.
- 52. Plaintiff requests judgment in her favor and against the Defendants for:
- 1. Actual damages, per 15 U.S.C. §1681n (a)(1)(A) and/or Cal. Civ. Code §1785.31(a)(2)(A) against all Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON; and per 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1) and/or Civil Code §1788.30(a) against Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, inclusive.
- 2. Statutory damages, per 15 U.S.C. §1681n (a)(1)(A) and/or Cal. Civ. Code §1785.19(a) against all Defendants; and per 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2) and/or Civil Code §1788.30(b) against Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, inclusive.
- 3. Costs and reasonable attorney's fees, per 15 U.S.C. §1681n (c) and/or Code of Civil Procedure §490.020 against all Defendants; and 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(3), and/or Civil Code §1788.30(c) against Defendants BMW, CAPITAL, CHASE, CITI, HSBC, MIDLAND and VERIZON, inclusive.
- 4. Punitive damages, per 15 U.S.C. §1681n (a)(2) and Cal. Civ. Code §1785.31(a)(2)(B), as the court may allow.
- 5. Injunctive relief, per Cal. Civ. Code §1785.31(b), ordering Defendants to delete the

reporting of the unverified accounts.

- 6. Declaratory relief, which is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §2201 and §2202.
- 7. Any other relief as this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

DATED: September 04, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

ARSHAK BARTOUMIAN,

Attorney for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I am the Plaintiff in the above-entitled action. I have read the foregoing complaint and know the contents thereof. The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are therein alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe it to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed: September 04, 2012

CHRISTINE HANNA, Plaintiff

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES- 13

Case 2:12-cv-07703-DSF-VBK Document 1 Filed 09/07/12 Page 14 of 18 Page ID #:16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

I (a) PLAINTIFFS (Check box if you are representing yourself □) CHRISTINE HANNA, an individual						DEFENDANTS BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES, CAPITAL ONE, CHASE BANK USA, CITIBANK, HSBC BANK USA, VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOM, MIDLAND FUNDING LLC							
(b) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address and Telephone Number. If you are representing yourself, provide same.) ARSHAK BARTOUMIAN (SBN 210370) OMNIA LEGAL INC					representing	Attorneys	(If Known)	<u> </u>					
	124 W. STOCKER ST. S	STE B, (GLENDALE, CA 91202	(818)	532-9339								
II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an X in one box only.) III. CITIZE					III. CITIZENS	NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES - For Diversity Cases Only n X in one box for plaintiff and one for defendant.)							
□ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff 23 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)					Citizen of This State PTF DEF Citizen of This State D 1 D 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in this State				PTF	DEF □ 4			
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)				enship	Citizen of Anoth	itizen of Another State				= □5	□ 5		
	<u> </u>				Citizen or Subjec	t of a For	eign Country	□3	□ 3	Foreign Nation	•	□ 6	□6
	RIGIN (Place an X in or												
	original 🗆 2 Remov roceeding State C		Remanded from Appellate Court	□4 Re Re	einstated or	Transferi	red from anothe	er distri	ct (spe	Distr	rict Ju	peal to I lge from gistrate	ı .
V. RE	EQUESTED IN COMPL	AINT:	JURY DEMAND: 🗹	Yes □	No (Check 'Yes'	only if de	manded in con	nplaint,)				
CLAS	S ACTION under F.R.C	.P. 23:								INT: \$ NOT YE	T ASSESSEI		
VI, C	AUSE OF ACTION (Cit 5 U.S.C. SEC 1681, CAI	e the U CIV C	S. Civil Statute under whi	ch you a									· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
VII. N	NATURE OF SUIT (Plac	e an X	in one box only.)	_							<u></u>		
	THER STATISTES State Reapportionment	II 110	CONTRACT:		TORUS		FORTS			RISONER	The second secon	BOR	
□ 410	Antitrust		Marine		SONAL INTURY Airplane		PERSONAL PROPERTY	F		ETITIONS Motions to	□ 710 Fair L Act	abor Sta	ndards
	Banks and Banking Commerce/ICC		Miller Act	□ 315	Airplane Product	□ 370	Other Fraud			Vacate Sentence	□ 720 Labor	Mgmt.	
	Rates/etc.	☐ 150	Negotiable Instrument Recovery of	□ 320	Liability Assault, Libel &		Truth in Lene Other Person		1 520	Habeas Corpus	Relati		
	Deportation		Overpayment &	ł	Slander	300			1530 1535 -	General Death Penalty	□ 730 Labor	Mgmt. ting &	
□ 470	Racketeer Influenced		Enforcement of	□ 330	Fed. Employers'	□ 385	Property Dan	nage 🗆	540	Mandamus/	Disclo	ung & sure Act	t
	and Corrupt Organizations	II 151	Judgment Medicare Act	□ 340	Liability Marine		Product Liab	ility		Other	☐ 740 Railw:	ay Labor	r Act
480	Consumer Credit		Recovery of Defaulted	□ 345	Marine Product	□ 422	ANKRUPICS Appeal 28 US		550	Civil Rights	□ 790 Other		
	Cable/Sat TV		Student Loan (Excl.	□ 260	Liability	722	158	30 11	1 222 1 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	Prison Condition	Litiga ☐ 791 Empl.	ion Det Inc	
	Selective Service		Veterans)		Motor Vehicle Motor Vehicle	□ 423	Withdrawal 2	28	1	ENALTY	Securi		•
□ 950	Securities/Commodities/ Exchange	□ 153		7 202	Product Liability	. Someone constraint	USC 157		610	Agriculture	PROPERT	YRIGH	ITS
□ 875	Customer Challenge 12	ŀ	Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	□ 360	Other Personal		IVIL RIGHTS			Other Food &	☐ 820 Copyr	ights	
	USC 3410	□ 160	Stockholders' Suits	III 262	Injury		Voting Employment	l _n		Drug Drug Beleted	□ 830 Patent		
	Other Statutory Actions	□ 190	Other Contract	L 302	Personal Injury- Med Malpractice		Housing/Acc			Drug Related Seizure of	□ 840 Trader SOCIALA	CANADA CONTRACTOR CONT	TW/-2
	Agricultural Act	□ 195	Contract Product	□ 365	Personal Injury-		mmodations	Ĭ.			□861 HIA(1395ff)	J. Alexandr
□ 092	Economic Stabilization Act	□ 106	Liability Franchise		Product Liability	□ 444				881	□ 862 Black	Lung (9)	23)
□ 893	Environmental Matters	NAMES OF TAXABLE PARTY	Franchise SEALEROPERTY	□ 368	Asbestos Personal	□ 445	American wit			Liquor Laws	□ 863 DIWC	/DIWW	, ′
			Land Condemnation		Injury Product Liability		Disabilities -			R.R. & Truck	(405(g))	
	Freedom of Info. Act	□ 220	Foreclosure	I)	MIGRATION -	₩ □ 446	Employment American wit			Airline Regs Occupational	□ 864 SSID	Title XV	1
□ 900	Appeal of Fee Determi-		Rent Lease & Ejectment	□ 462	Naturalization		Disabilities -	⁻		Safety /Health	□ 865 RSI (4 FEDERAL	UO(g))	npe
	nation Under Equal		Torts to Land		Application	1	Other				□ 870 Taxes	(U.S. Pl	aintiff
□ 950	Access to Justice Constitutionality of	LI 245		⊔ 463	Habeas Corpus- Alien Detainee	□ 440	Other Civil		-	•		endant)	
	State Statutes	270 ت	All Other Real Property	□ 465	Other Immigration Actions	.	Rights				□ 871 IRS-T USC 7	hird Part	ty 26
				W	12.7	71	5		_				
FOR O	FFICE USE ONLY:	Case N	umber:	₩ •	a (_ /	/				•			

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: H If yes, list case number(s):	as this action been	previously filed in this court a	and dismissed, remanded or closed? ≝No □ Yes					
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Ha If yes, list case number(s):	ve any cases been p	reviously filed in this court th	at are related to the present case? E No					
□ C.	Arise from the sar Call for determina For other reasons Involve the same	ne or closely related transaction tion of the same or substantial would entail substantial duplic patent, trademark or copyright	lly related or similar questions of law and fact; or cation of labor if heard by different judges; or t, <u>and</u> one of the factors identified above in a, b or c also is present.					
(a) List the County in this District;	California County	outside of this District: State	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
LOS ANGELES			VARIOUS					
- January II and government,	California County ts agencies or empl	outside of this District; State i oyees is a named defendant.	if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
LOS ANGELES			VARIOUS					
(c) List the County in this District; Note: In land condemnation c	California County of ases, use the locati	outside of this District; State i on of the tract of land involv	f other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose.					
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country					
LOS ANGELES			VARIOUS					
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: In land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, V to the location of th	engira, Santa Barbara, or S	an Luis Obispo Counties					
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (OR PRO PER): 📌	Timal S	Date 9/4/2012					
but is used by the Clerk of the C	ourt for the purpose	of statistics, venue and initiati	mation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings e of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ing the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)					
Key to Statistical codes relating to So Nature of Suit Code								
Hattie of Stit Chile	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement of	Cause of Action					
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C. 1935FF(b))						
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)						
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))						
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))						
864	SSID	All claims for supplementa Act, as amended.	l security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security					
865	RSI	All claims for retirement (o U.S.C. (g))	old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42					

ARSHAK BARTOUMIAN (SBN 210370) OMNIA-LEGAL, INC TEL. 818-532-9339 124 W STOCKER ST STE B GLENDALE CA 91202

	DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTINE HANNA, an individual	CASE NUMBER CV12.7703
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	
BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC., A Delaware Limited Liability Company-et-al-(see attached for additional defendants)	SUMMONS
DEFENDANT(S).	
TO: DEFENDANT(S): CHRISTINE HANNA (See attached for additional Defendants) A lawsuit has been filed against you. Within 21 days after service of this summer	ns on you (not counting the day you received it), you
must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached of counterclaim □ cross-claim or a motion under Rule 1 or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, AR 124 W STOCKER ST STE B, GLENDALE, CA 91202	complaint amended complaint 2 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer SSHAK BARTOUMIAN , whose address is
judgment by default will be entered against you for the r your answer or motion with the court.	
SEP - 7 2012 Dated:	Clerk, U.S. District Court By: SHEA BOURGEOIS Deputy Clerk
	(Seal of the Court) 1184

[Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United States agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allowed 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].

CV-01A (12/07)

ARSHAK BARTOUMIAN (SBN 210370)
OMNIA LEGAL, INC.
124 W STOCKER ST STE B
GLENDALE, CA 91202
T. 818-532-9339
F. 818-394-6452
EMAIL: DISPUTES@OMNIALEGAL.ORG

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

8

20

21

22

24

25

26

27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

9 CHRISTINE HANNA, an individual, 10 Plaintiff, BMW FINANCIAL SERVICES, LLC., A 12 Delaware Limited Liability Company CAPITAL ONE N.A., A National Association 13 CHASE BANK USA N.A., A National Association CITIBANK SD, N.A., A National Association 15 HSBC BANK USA N.A., A National Association 16 VERIZON WIRELESS TELECOM, INC., A California Corporation 17 MIDLAND FUNDING, LLC., A Delaware 18 Limited Liability Company 19

Defendants.

CASE NO.:

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES:

- 1) VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL FAIR CREDIT REPORTING ACT;
- VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S CONSUMER CREDIT REPORTING AGENCIES ACT;
- VIOLASATIONS OF FEDERAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT:
- 4) VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA'S ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT;
- 5) DECLARATORY RELIEF.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

This action is brought by Plaintiff CHRISTINE HANNA ("Plaintiff") by and through her attorney Arshak Bartoumian against all named Defendants for violations of the Fair Credit Reporting Act [15 U.S.C. §1681 et seq.] ("FCRA") and California's Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act [California Civil Code §1785.2 et seq.] ("CCRAA"), and for violations of Fair Debt Collection Practices Act [15 U.S.C. §1692-1692p] ("FDCPA"), California's Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act [California Civil Code §1788 et seq.] ("RFDCPA") against select Defendants.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Dolly Gee and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Jay C. Gandhi.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

CV12- 7703 DMG (JCGx)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge
NOTICE TO COUNSEL
A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is

Western Division
312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8
Los Angeles, CA 90012

Southern Division
411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053
Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516

Eastern Division
3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134
Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location: